

## Tiered Licensure TAC Meeting – May 21, 2014

Attending: Mikki Nuckols (via conference call) Senator Janie Ward-Engelking, Marilyn Whitney (in for Tracie Bent) Superintendent Tom Luna, Penni Cyr, Rod Gramer and Christina Linder (via conference call).

Superintended Luna welcomed the group and talked about the last meeting. State board suggested a couple of ideas - action items and said to come back with more details and we continued with an in-depth discussion of the Danielson Framework.

We need to have discussion about student achievement. Today we will review language presented last week – we will also talk about appeals process and will look at Danielson Framework and the 22 components questioning can they be answered with a yes/no or not applicable and Tier 3 licensure.

We need to keep discussions moving so we can go back to the committee with recommendations so that they are confident in what we are accomplishing. We want them to be able to make decisions based on our recommendations.

Let's look at language we used – similar to language in board rule on teacher evaluations. We need to show specific measures that we want to use. We need to create a list or language that a certain number of components would be required to show student growth and look at language on measurable student achievement.

We have been asked for specifics that districts would be required to use. When teachers start moving through the tiered licensure we will have ways of showing growth. There are many measures that are already being used at state and local level s so let's start with Smarter Balance Assessment. (SBA)

Mr. Gramer commented that one that should be used is, either SBA or something equivalent, in case something else comes along that we want to use.

Supt. Luna asked if there was any objection to using this.

Ms. Cyr referred to Ms. Kellerer's multiple measures – other states have multiple measures that can be used so let's not reinvent the wheel , instead let us brainstorm on multiple measures that are already out there that we can use.

Supt. Luna agreed that together we can create a list of measurable tests:

- SBA (Smarter Balance Assessment)
- EOC (End of Course)
- Formative Assessments
- Teacher Constructed Assessments
- Pre and Post Tests
- SLOs (Student Learning Objectives)
- Performance based assessments

Supt. Luna asked if Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) would fit on this list. Meridian School District uses this heavily but does it fit?

Ms. Cyr said that Map can be used but it should be separated under local control and districts can choose.

Mr. Gramer suggested Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI) and Standard Based Assessments (SAT)

Mr. Raney stated that since we are brainstorming we will list any and all suggestions.

Supt. Luna suggested Advanced Placement (AP) exams and International Baccalaureate (IB) exams. By the time we end this conversation I would like us to create a list that a district can use.

Mr. Raney suggested Math Concepts and Application (MCAP) and Mathematics Computation (MCOMP)  
Mr. Gramer asked that if we are recommending multiple measures what is a multiple measure – two?

Supt. Luna suggested that we give the State Board a list of eight and the district has to pick six or we need to identify the minimum amount that has to be used. We need to add Professional Technical as well.

Mr. Taylor suggested Idaho Standards Achievement Tests (ISAT) Science.

Mr. Gramer wanted to know what tests could be used for other courses not covered by Smarter Balance Assessment, etc.

Mr. Raney responded that EOCs will work for other courses as a part of local measures.

Supt. Luna continued the discussion. How will this affect an individual teacher?

Ms. Cyr asked how these will narrow down to work for an individual teacher.

Mr. Gramer reminded everyone that this has to be broad enough to fit various teachers so they can all be used to measure growth –in SBA– we will know where the class scored in spring and again in the next spring. We will be able to measure the growth.

Not any one assessment will fit all students and all grades. There will be a paradigm shift and we will have to drill down to make it fit.

Supt. Luna stated that Ms. Cyr was right this time – we do use standardized tests and I think there are a number of these that do go down to class level and of them won't go down to an individual class or teacher.

Ms. Cyr asked that we go back to discussing SBA. There are all kinds of variables – maybe fall to spring SBA would be a better gauge of student growth and would be well documented.

Supt. Luna commented that there will be opportunities to make changes. The districts can do interim assessments and they can do it throughout the year.

Ms. Cyr asked how much time will that take and cost. Not many districts will do that lengthy of a test.

Supt. Luna replied that we do have the ability to do testing at different times throughout the year – fall to spring, etc., whatever the district decides is best.

Mr. Gramer wanted the committee to know that he is not saying that SBA is perfect and there is always the chance that it may change – but if we are putting an emphasis on it – we should have a fall assessment and a spring assessment – because of state law, core standards – let us keep it on the list.

Supt. Luna proposed that we try to keep this moving – is there any opposition to removing Act and SAT.

Ms. Cyr stated that she thinks the list should be vast and long – leave everything on the list that measures student growth and forward to the State Board of Education

Mr. Gramer thinks we should put every credible test possible on the list and give them many options. Some are more important than others and some if the local district decides to use it, would be fine. I would like them to require them to use certain things on the list...I would want to know what the district chose to use why they chose the ones they did.

Supt. Luna responded that the committee did not ask for a laundry list, but it would be helpful to show what all was considered and then make a recommendation. We could present a laundry list that everything on it is acceptable but a certain number of them are required in the evaluation.

Ms. Whitney said that one recommendation was to push as much down to local control as possible.

Supt. Luna stated that there was a lot of talk about autonomy but just as strong for accountability. There needs to be a balance. For legislators the rubber meets the road on how students are achieving so there has to be balance.

Ms. Cyr state that this should not to be a negotiation for money from the legislature. We need to list the best ideas for student achievement – not a whittled down list but the best for student growth.

Sen. Ward-Engelking added that we need as many valid tests as possible on this list that are used and let the districts decide what the best on multiple levels is.

Mr. Gramer said we should give local districts maximum authority to choose several and then others would be required. Maybe we should require SBA, IRI and MAP and then the district can pick two others for measurement from the approved list.

Ms. Whitney commented that if you chose SBA you should use ISAT Science, as well.

Supt. Luna said that the MAP test could be on the list but not required – the district has to pay for this and we should not make it a requirement.

Rod added that if we chose to include Map then the state should fund it if we feel it is important.

Ms. Cyr said we need to consider demographics – school districts, school teachers – pre and post exams – the state should make a list of possible learning objectives without mapping it out.

Supt. Luna said the issue of demographics we understand – focusing on growth not just achievement. Some schools that have the most growth have some of the toughest demographics. I am comfortable with SBA for this. I am not comfortable making MAP as a requirement, they don't see it as aligned – I don't think it should be required.

Mr. Telleria stated that IRI should be required and also a pretest for music, etc.

Supt. Luna stated that he doesn't have a problem with the laundry list. Now we need to identify required measures and then list others that can be used.

Ms. Whitney said that the Federal Government requires National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP)

Supt. Luna replied that some schools don't use it.

Mr. Gramer mentioned that he loves NAEP but doesn't know if it would be a fair measurement.

Mr. Taylor said that it doesn't work for this.

Supt. Luna agreed that he doesn't think it will work either. SBA and IRI will cover most teachers. Do we want to identify SLOs that will be required for other teachers and subjects that are not covered by Smarter Balance?

Teachers set goals but they will need time and resources to write SLOs. Pilot for higher Ed is to train teachers to write SLOs. We are not objecting but saying that if it is one of the measures there needs to be a huge piece for professional development that goes with it.

Mr. Gramer said that pre and post exams for say a history teacher is not covered by SBA – they can do pre and post assessments that will easily measure the effect the teacher has had on those students. In other words, how well am I doing from fall to spring – measurable for the fall coming in and leaving in the spring? This should be tailored to the discipline that teacher is teaching.

Supt. Luna asked what the capacity of districts outside of the valley is. They will rely heavily on the tests that the state is supplying and what they can beg or borrow from others. SLOs are about measurable assessments. This could be for a year, over a unit, or be for an IP, any grouping. There are a lot of uses for SLOs. We must have pre and post to show growth that can be used by every teacher.

Supt. Luna asked should we have this as one that is required for non- Smarter Balance core courses.

Ms. Whitney thinks another committee will work on this.

Mr. Gramer stated that he liked what Ms. Cyr is saying for student objectives having a pre and post. I believe SBA should be on the list and the SLOs.

Mr. Gramer said he would like to make a motion that there would be five assessments, three required and two would be the districts choice. Give the full committee a list with legitimate measures that have to be required including SBA, IRI and two others of their choice with SLOs embedded.

No second ---

Supt. Luna asked Ms. Whitney if ISAT Science be used in an SLO.

Ms. Whitney said there would be push back from STEM.

Mr. Telleria, are you saying that each teacher has five assessments?

Mr. Gramer asked if we are going to mandate at least three.

Mr. Telleria said that a second grade teacher would use IRI or whatever is appropriate.

Mr. Gramer stated that if five is the hang up we can change this and require three. When appropriate IRI, SBA and SLOs.

Supt. Luna said that we require that there be at least three assessments used and that of those 3 they use IRI, SBA and SLOs. In other words, if I am a 2<sup>nd</sup> grade teacher and IRI is applicable my district would have to come up with two more.

Mr. Gramer asked if SBA isn't appropriate then they can use another one off the list. I make a motion to use three assessments, IRI, SBA and SLO's

Sen. Ward-Engelking seconded the motion.

Sen. Ward – Engelking thought that some of the wording should be changed – multiple assessments.  
We can weigh the pig but we have to have time to feed it. Be careful with wording - multiple assessments

Mr. Gramer stated that we should support the requirement for SBA and IRI but leaving the others to district's discretion. When SBA does not apply then use an SLO with pre and post assessments tied to it. What measures can a teacher be measured against when SBA does not apply, such as music – pre and post assessment could be used there as well.

At least three assessments must be used in demonstrations of a teacher's students achievement. Of those three the IRI and SBA must be included as applicable. SLOs must be included for non-tested SBA and IRI subjects. The list should be

included as part of the motion – other measures chosen at the local district level to include the attached list including Smarter Balance Assessments or equivalent.

Mr. Raney stated that as a former principal you can find growth in the SBA. It is as valid as any other assessment.

Mr. Gramer said that after listening to the discussion, SLOs would be discussed by teacher and administrators, good way for non- SBAC and IRI to be measured.

Supt. Luna said if you are not teaching an SBA or IRI subject then you use an SLO.

Mr. Telleria commented that if none applies then if I as a teacher would have to use an SLO and two others from the list, correct? This sets goals and objective.

Ms. Whitney added that they have to use three at least, but they can use more if they want.

Supt. Luna asked Mr. Raney to read what we have so far to vote on.

Mr. Raney read:

For movement to and maintenance in Tier 2: At least three assessments must be used in demonstration of a teacher's student achievement. Of those three, the Idaho Reading Indicator and Smarter Balanced Assessment (or equivalent statewide) must be included as applicable. Student Learning Objectives including pre and post assessment for student learning must be included for non-tested (SBA, IRI) subjects, other measures chosen at the district level, to include the attached list.

- Smarter Balanced Assessment (or the equivalent statewide)
- Student Learning Objectives (includes pre and post assessments)
- End of Course exams
- Formative assessments
- Teacher-constructed assessments
- \*Pre and Post Tests
- Performance-based assessments
- \*Idaho Reading Indicator
- SAT
- ACT
- Advanced Placement Exams
- International Baccalaureate
- MCap, Measures of Concepts and Applications
- MComp, Measures of Mathematics Computation
- \*ISAT Science
- Professional Technical Exams
- MAP, Measures of Academic Progress

Voting yes - Ms. Nuckols, Ms. Whitney, Supt. Luna and Mr. Gramer, Ms. Cyr voted no.

Mr. Luna – Now let us discuss the appeals process.

Mr. Raney shared the direction we are going with appeals process – teacher would not appeal to Professional Standards Committee but go to the local level. The board wants to see a process and the teacher can appeal the process.

Mr. Gramer asked if the full committee would be concerned that the teacher could not appeal to PSC.

Mr. Raney agreed to that. The impression I got was the concern that appeals wouldn't go directly to PSC.

Ms. Cry said she was not sure that was consensus. If you only give a basic when a teacher has done outside work and extra stuff and you do that for five years and only receive a basic, the teacher needs to be able to go outside of their district and then before a body of their peers.

Sen. Ward-Engelking stated that if there is an appeals process it must be a body of their peers.

Mr. Gramer said it should go to local authority first and then to PSC— very reasonable.

Ms. Cyr said an evaluator only has to be trained once and then they are certified for life. Teachers that are licensed by the state then evaluated by someone who was trained once – I don't agree

Supt. Luna interjected that we should stay on track and we can revisit the definition of certified evaluator at a later time.

Ms. Cyr asked who would evaluate if there is not a trained evaluator and who would pay for that. If this is our recommendation then we need to address this.

Mr. Gramer said that we need to address how we make this fair and we need to address the issue of administrators.

11:00 - Break until 12:30

Started – 12:30, Senator Ward-Engelking did not return.

Supt. Luna recommended that we get back to discussing appeals.

Mr. Raney asked should the appeal be for the process.

Supt. Luna asked if a teacher wants to appeal on 22 components or if the teacher wants to appeal the process or appeal on extenuating circumstances. He asked if there are any comments.

Mr. Gramer asked if the evaluator would be an administrator at the school and if you had a disagreement it should go to the District Superintendent and then to board, if not it will go to PSC.

Mr. Raney stated that Supt. Linda Clark at the Meridian School District doesn't allow appeals.

Supt. Luna said that Dr. Clark said in her district they don't allow appeals as part of their process. What is the recourse if you are not satisfied with the evaluation? Mr. Raney does not like the idea of trumping the principal or superintendent.

Ms. Cyr stated that if evaluations determine licensure then they need to have a very good process for teachers to appeal. Administrators who affect someone's career we need to have some kind of process for the teachers by their peers.

Supt. Luna asked if we are impeding on local education.

Mr. Gramer said that in the private sector there is a one-up no matter what you do on an evaluation. It seems that there should always be an appeal process – not everyone is perfect and there may be grudges that come to bear. It should start at the local level and because it a state license at risk, they should have the opportunity to go to the state and play a role. There should be a local appeals process before they take it to the state -

Supt. Luna commented that we have conversations about appeals and there is an evaluation by a certified evaluator. A teacher has a right to request a 2<sup>nd</sup> evaluation, someone outside their district. If there are two evaluations that say the same, then it stands.

Mr. Gramer said as long as it was an evaluator and it is from an independent 3<sup>rd</sup> party with no relationship to the superintendent or the original evaluator.

Mr. Raney responded that I think we are heading down the right road; second evaluators may only have a small portion of that teacher's performance, not near as much as the original teacher and administrator.

Ms. Whitney said as part of an administrator's licensure they should have to do continuing proficiency.

Mr. Telleria said that he would like to show how this works. Usually the district has a policy which includes a pre-conference and then a post conference. Principals walk through classes and then add to the evaluation materials and then there is a formal evaluation. The process of evaluation is not one time it is an ongoing process. What happens is the first year teacher is evaluated, if the teacher gets a poor evaluation or doesn't agree – they write up something to go into their file, if it is a poor evaluation you are not allowed to argue it. Year two the same process, a pre-conference evaluation, if the teacher is marked unsatisfactory we put them on an intensive plan or we release them. Year three you get an informal review which is very choreographed. So when you think this through – think how this process is going to play out – we may argue over the word basic. This is serious to the teacher because they can lose their job. If the teacher loses they will go to IEA and sue the school district.

Mr. Gramer asked Mr. Telleria, is there an appeals process for your teacher if they disagree, not in the first 2 years but in the third year? Do others in the state have an appeal process?

Mr. Telleria said that in the Boise School District, we are a little more generous than most but we must follow the law. Poor is not acceptable – basic is.

Ms. Cyr commented that she was in the classroom for more than twenty eight (28) years at the same time Charlotte Danielson came into being. I don't know if this has changed because of Danielson?

Mr. Gramer said he believes this is board policy. Danielson calls for pre-conference.

Supt. Luna asked Mr. Raney if every district submits their plans to the State Department of Education and do they all have pre-conference?

Mr. Raney answered that all submit and they all include pre and post conferences.

Mr. Gramer said that so much is at risk, perhaps we can live with the current system but I really think teachers need the fairest process as possible. As Ms. Whitney said if they get a non-satisfactory evaluation then they can appeal it. If after a second evaluation with the same results the teacher would have to prove why they should have a proficient and then the two evaluators would have to agree and then after that they would all go to PSC and make the case from all points of view and then the Standards Commission would make the final decision.

Ms. Whitney asked, isn't part of evaluation peer observations? What happened with that?

Mr. Raney answered that peer observation can be used as long as it is a trained evaluator

Mr. Luna requested that we put together some language.

Mr. Gramer said if a teacher does not agree with the first evaluation then it goes to a second trained evaluator and then to board or superintendent and if no satisfaction, then appeal to the state. Is this only an appeal of the process or all of the other reasons? What would be the three criteria for an appeal?

Ms. Whitney asked who would do the second evaluation – someone outside the district.

Mr. Gramer said we need to protect the integrity of the process. If the second evaluator is brought in then it should be a trained evaluator, not from the same school, possibly a trained evaluator from the same area and within the same area of education.

Ms. Whitney, here is a scenario, Mr. Telleria; you said that this is an ongoing process. If an outside person comes in to do this they will not have the information from a year long process and what will the cost be.

Mr. Gramer stated we owe it to everyone that the process is fair to everyone and credible, because people will lose their job. Right now no one loses their license. If you are going to take someone's license away, then we need to create a fair appeals process. If a second evaluator comes in and uses the Danielson model, it may not be the same as the administrator from the school, it could be better because they don't have an ax to grind. In business if something is important enough to the success of the company, the money is found. If we think this Tiered Licensure is important then we need to make the process is fair before we take their license away. We need to go to the legislature and get this funded.

Mr. Telleria said that he can always create an extenuating circumstance. As a school district I will never let it get this far, so it will not be basic. As a teacher I will step up my game and for 40 minutes I can find my way around this. I will cause a problem between the two evaluators because they will now need to figure out how to agree.

Ms. Cyr stated that the administrator will set up the evaluation by finding another evaluator that will agree so they can get rid of the teacher.

Mr. Gramer stated that to keep the system fair, maybe the first evaluation is done by a team from the school district and to make sure that if there is a second evaluation, it is decided by the standards board that does the second evaluation from the list of approved evaluators.

Supt. Luna, so you envision a list of trained evaluators and the state can pick from the list for the second evaluation so they have an independent evaluation, not picked by the school so that they are not prejudiced.  
Taylor responded that this would work well with the tiered licensure model

Mr. Gramer said that every evaluator should be trained and be effective. You don't appoint them to go because they are your favorite you pick them because they are close in the area and they meet the criteria. If a license wasn't at stake then this process could be different.

Mr. Telleria asked why they would have to be outside the district.

Supt. Luna answered; small districts would need someone outside the district – not the large districts. They may request, would be better language.

Mr. Gramer, people talk and everyone knows what is happening with any teacher. If it was me I would rather have someone that comes from another district so that it could be fair and unbiased.

Mr. Rayne said we may have a speed bump. Our wording says, picked by commission, since they only meet five times per year then maybe it should be a designated person that picks the evaluator.

Supt. Luna reminded the committee that we do that now for other departments from an approved list.

Ms. Cyr said the wording can be changed, we need to fix this. We can use a list that was vetted by PSC, as certified evaluators.

Mr. Raney asked if all the evaluators have to be approved by the PSC.

Supt. Luna answered: yes

Mr. Raney asked if PSC can disapprove an evaluator.

Mr. Gramer asked who will put the good housekeeping seal of approval on the evaluator list.

Ms. Whitney asked if anyone who is trained to do these evaluations should be on the list. Sometimes it will come down to people that are willing to be on this list.

Mr. Gramer said he would be surprised if anyone on this list would not want to do their civic duty.

Supt. Luna continued that we will have a list of trained evaluators and if there is an appeal then a second evaluator will be selected from a trained evaluator list, The third appeal will be to the school board and then if not satisfied they can appeal to PSC.

Ms. Cry said they should not have to go to the school board because they are not certified. They should have to have an easier process to go before their peers.

Mr. Telleria asked what does contested mean. If this is linked to a license, then we need to nail down what year this can start. If I contest my evaluation for any reason, can I make an appeal?

Mr. Gramer wanted to know if relevance to keeping a license then it is not appealable. What if a teacher appeals every year? Year one – basic, year two – basic, year three – basic. If it happens in year four then you can appeal. It has direct impact on the license. You can appeal if it is relevant to keeping your license.

Mr. Luna, I can understand where the first year is not important to your license but by your second year it becomes relevant. Maybe for a novice it is non-appealable. Maybe year three and four it is appealable because it will affect your license.

Mr. Gramer asked if the committee understood what he is trying to say. First two years are not appealable, year three and year four are.

Mr. Telleria, now you have limited who can appeal.

Supt, Luna reminded the committee that every evaluation is critical whether it affects the teacher's license or not. Teachers should feel comfortable that it is a fair evaluation of their work. Should they have the opportunity if they disagree about the evaluation, shouldn't they be able to appeal?

Mr. Telleria stated that it is currently available for teachers to have a second evaluation.

Mr. Luna asked how does this work in Salmon or other small districts? Can they get a second evaluation?

Mr. Telleria said he believes there ought to be a system in place that they can have more than one evaluation.

Mr. Gramer agreed that the teacher should have the opportunity to appeal, especially if it affects their license. Novice teachers get a hall pass anyway so no appeal on 1 – 2 years and only 3 – 4 when it affects their license.

Tom asked Mr. Raney to read the language that we have so far...

Mr. Raney read and there was continued discussion.....

Mr. Raney stated that extenuating circumstances should only be appealable by the district; this will help keep the appeals down.

Supt. Luna responded that this will be getting the superintendent involved? Add wording on this, just like most school boards do now, that superintendents would continue to be involved.

Mr. Gramer asked if this means that the case could first go to a superintendent who won't make the decision, but will make a recommendation. They can make a judgment call on who has the stronger case. Then it can go to the school board – hopefully this will only happen infrequently.

Mr. Telleria responded that if no agreement is reached by teacher and evaluator then the superintendent can bring a recommendation. This needs to be an informal process.

Ms. Nuckols stated that she likes how the discussion has gone and she especially likes the option of getting an evaluator from another district.

Mr. Gramer stated the reason we are putting appeals process into place is because it has a direct relationship to their license.

Ms. Cyr asked why it says after extenuating circumstance can only be appealed by the school boards.

Mr. Gramer replied that educators ask teachers to take on a tough assignment and they should not be penalized if they do so. Through the appeals process the district can appeal for the teacher and go to the state and explain the circumstances.

Ms. Cyr asked: how does this fall into this statement when this is about the teacher and not about the school board?

Mr. Raney answered that this is standing up for the teacher when there are extenuating circumstances so we don't lose a teacher.

Mr. Gramer suggested that maybe the evaluator does not know there were extenuating circumstances but the school board can go and say that the school requested the teacher to do the tough assignment.

Mr. Telleria asked about a sick employee. The district can tell PSC that they want to keep this teacher and that they are better than the evaluation looks.

Ms. Cyr to Mr. Telleria – it is only appealable by the school board. Say the teacher hasn't been firing on all cylinders and doesn't get all proficient on their evaluation. The teacher should still have the opportunity to appeal.

Mr. Gramer stated that we have now extended this to cover many areas. If we are going to have a fair process, then a teacher should have the right to appeal something that has extenuating circumstance including sickness, divorce, etc. Only the teacher or the school district can define those extenuating circumstance.

Continued discussion on wording.

Supt. Luna asked Mr. Raney to read the final wording.

Mr. Raney read:

The appeal process is available to the teacher beginning in the second year of contracted employment as a Tier 1 license-holder. Following a contested evaluation proficiency ranking, the following appeal process shall be employed only when pertinent to the teacher's licensure. The process shall include an evaluation performed by a second certified evaluator. The teacher may request that the second certified evaluator, selected by the Chief Certification Officer, be appointed from outside of the district. The Professional Standards Commission shall annually approve the list of certified evaluators from which the Chief Certification Officer appoints the second evaluator. If no agreement is reached between teacher and evaluators, the superintendent of designee shall make a recommendation to the school board to

consider the appeal through an informal review process. If no agreement is reached between teacher and school board, the teacher may appeal to the Professional Standards Commission.

Appeals to the Professional Standards Commission shall only be made when pertinent to the teacher's licensure. Reasons for appeal are: disagreement regarding the outcome of the evaluation, disagreement with the process employed to reach the conclusions on the evaluation, and extenuating circumstances.

The deadline for appeals shall be two weeks following the deadline for completion of evaluation.

Supt. Luna asked if we have a motion to accept the wording.

Ms. Whitney moved to accept wording.

Mr. Gramer seconded the motion.

Voting yes – Mr. Gramer, Ms. Whitney, Supt. Luna, and Ms. Nuckols. Ms. Cyr voted no.

Break – 10 minutes

Supt. Luna stated that the committee has been asked by the larger committee to look at 22 components – and ask the question, can they be answered with a yes/no or not applicable. Should we leave the recommendation as is or discuss all 22 components?

Ms. Whitney said that Brian Smith's comments were about 4d –involvement in culture – these are basic – Mr. Smith was saying there may be teachers that would score basic on those areas but that would not mean they are not a good teacher.

Supt. Luna stated that someone said Mr. Smith wasn't using the current language.

Ms. Whitney asked if this is the current language.

Mr. Raney stated that the concerns were based on the fact, to be professional; you would have to spend a lot of time outside of the school day. This is a concern. Rather than breaking down the language of the rubric, it is more about sharing in the community- it is not necessarily outside of the school day. I believe that should be expected of a professional educator.

Ms. Cyr asked what else is in the hands of practitioners. Mr. Smith was making the point, I think, that educators want to be the best they can for their students in the classroom. He said if a teacher hasn't volunteered to supervise a dance, etc. does that make a teacher so bad that they should lose a license.

Mr. Raney answered, not if that is the only component, they should participate without being asked.

Ms. Cyr reminded the committee that it is how you read it. If a principal asked a teacher to chaperone a dance, and she says yes, but she doesn't volunteer, does that mean she is a bad teacher and her license should not be affected by it.

More discussion.....

Mr. Gramer – In Ms. Kellerer's email there was support for the 22 components. Amanda Ripley spoke about other countries and what they focus on for student achievement. The parents spend time with their kids, working on education, doing sports, doing a lot of things that are not all about education.

Mr. Raney reminded the committee that this is a matter of personal preference; teachers should be proficient across the board. Student achievement will be directly affected. All of the components directly relate to the Danielson Framework. Teacher involvement affects student achievement

Supt. Luna asked if some of these should be yes or no.

Mr. Raney answered, not unless they are proficient.

Mr. Telleria said that you cannot expect a four year teacher to be as proficient as a ten year teacher. A ten year teacher should be more proficient. Small schools have to have lots of volunteers; larger schools don't have to volunteer as much. A new teacher will just be basic but in five years he will climb up the ladder

Ms. Whitney mentioned that these components will be applied in different ways; in domains one, two, and three and especially four. I do not want my child to be taught by a basic teacher. When I read definition of basic, it has a very low bar.

Mr. Telleria added that basic means you have work to do. They are not proficient.

Mr. Gramer added that in any profession you won't be as good as one that had been there for a long time. By the time they are in the 2<sup>nd</sup> tier they should be proficient. We don't expect them to be proficient in the first tier.

Supt. Luna suggested that this is a philosophical discussion. We are not focused on any domain. Are they equally important or should we go through them individually and decide if there are one or more that need looking so we should look at all of them individually.

Ms. Whitney said, I think this committee should go over them separately so we can see if they are all applicable.

Mr. Gramer added that it will take hours to slice and dice. This is a responsibility for the larger group. If they decide that it needs to be sliced and diced then it can be done by a different committee with more educators on it. This group is not broad enough to make that decision.

Ms. Whitney also reminded the committee that sometimes we are re-inventing the wheel that others have already done. There was a task force that looked at frameworks for evaluation. This is the tool that was decided on. Rod I will support a motion to accept all 22 components.

Supt. Luna told the group that Ms. Kellerer and Ms. Linder believe that we should keep these 22 components. Why would we not expect teachers to score proficient in all areas to move from Tier 1 to Tier 2?

Ms. Cyr explained that this evaluation tool was not chosen when it was going to affect licensing.

Supt. Luna said that the answer is no. If the larger group wants to revisit it they can and we can talk about it with them at a later date.

Continued discussion of the 22 components.....

Ms. Linder added that higher education has run into this before but you may have more than 22 components. They need to show clear alignment for proficiency to those 22 components. What was looked at for Boise was that there was clear alignment.

Ms. Whitney indicated that there needs to be clearer language stating that districts are required to submit plans that show they are aligned to the 22 components.

Supt. Luna asked Mr. Raney to read the language that has been put together so far.....

Mr. Raney read draft language.

Mr. Gramer asked why we would want to make it easier for them in Tier 2 for maintenance.

Mr. Raney asked what if there is a basic in the fifth year – are we going to decertify them.

Mr. Gramer stated that with the performance plan it helps them to go from basic to proficient. There is a period of time to move up to proficient – I would like sideboards on that. If we are asking novice to be proficient two years in a row why would we not ask the more experienced teacher to do it.

Supt. Luna asked what if we took a reverse and said you couldn't have two basics in a row or we would decertify them.

Ms. Linder said that seems like a really real solution.

Supt. Luna asked if we are we talking about the same component.

Ms. Linder said I need to think about that. Two years of basic in the same component – absolutely not –basic in different components two years in a row, something to think about.

Mr. Gramer suggested that being proficient three out of five years and for sure in the last year, cannot score basic in the same component two years in a row. Maybe we should talk about it for Tier 3.

Supt. Luna agreed that maybe it would be better for a Tier 3 license. Each tier should get harder. Danielson describes most teachers as ending up in the Professional 2. In order to maintain a professional license you are proficient for three out of five including the final year.

Supt. Luna asked Mr. Raney to read the final language.

Mr. Raney read:

Maintenance of Tier 2 Licensure:

Danielson Framework – All 22 components of the Danielson Framework must be rated as proficient during three of the five years of certification, including the final year prior to recertification. Teachers with four or less basic ratings during their fifth year of Tier 2 certification will have a one-year provisional certification to meet proficiency in all components.

Ms. Whitney moved to approve the language

Mr. Gramer seconded the motion.

Voting yes – Mr. Gramer, Ms. Whitney, Supt. Luna, Ms. Nuckols and Ms. Linder. Ms. Cyr voted no.

Supt. Luna talked about Tier 3 licensure. At the next meeting on June 4<sup>th</sup>, we will discuss the move from Tier 2 to Tier 3 and how to maintain Tier 3. Is there any other research we need? Mr. Gramer will not be at the June 4<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Ms. Cyr made the motion to adjourn, all in favor.